

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/892,227

Applicant(s)

BUJARD ET AL.

Examiner

Peter Paras, Jr.

Art Unit

1632

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Peter Paras, Jr.

(3) _____

(2) DeAnn Smith

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 09 June 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 36.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative indicated that limiting the pending claims to a transgenic mouse as per the Examiner's proposal is not acceptable. The Examiner suggested that providing a declaration disclosing the creation of a different transgenic non-human mammal may be sufficient to enable claim breadth to a transgenic non-human mammal.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required